Appendix I: Resume of Principal Investigator

DANIEL THORNTON ELLIOTT

CURRENT STATUS

President, Georgia Council of Professional Archaeologists
President, LAMAR Institute, Watkinsville, Georgia
Senior Archaeologist, Southern Research Historic Preservation Consultants, Ellerslie, Georgia

EDUCATION

B.A., Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill 1976
M.A., Anthropology, University of Georgia, Athens 1980

PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS

Certified in Field Research, Society of Professional Archaeologists, 1993
Vice President, Georgia Council of Professional Archaeologists 1996-1998

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES

Register of Professional Archaeologists (ROPA)
Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA)
Society for Historical Archaeology
Society for American Archaeology
Society for Georgia Archaeology, Life member
Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Life member
Archaeological Society of South Carolina
Greater Atlanta Archaeological Society Board Member, 1987
Georgia Council of Professional Archaeologists, Board of Directors, 1990-1992, Vice President, 1996-1998
LAMAR Institute, Board of Directors & Secretary

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE: 25

SELECTED PROJECTS

Colonial Ebenezer, Effingham County, Georgia

Directed historical research, survey, and excavations for the LAMAR Institute on the town and outlying farmsteads of Ebenezer. Excavations on these sites has continued for more than a decade, and the work has been thoroughly reported.

Fort Benning, Georgia and Alabama

Directed and reported on large surveys covering more than 55,000 acres on the U.S. Army base. Compiled a Historic Preservation Plan and designed a data base for managing cultural resources on the base. Tested and reported on several dozen sites in the Installation. Currently serving as a Principal Investigator on a three year continuing services contract through Southern Research, Historic Preservation Consultants, Inc. at Fort Benning.

National Forests, Georgia and South Carolina

Surveyed more than 18,000 acres and recorded and reported on more than 700 archaeological sites on five National Forests in Georgia and South Carolina. Directed test excavations on more than 50 sites, including the Lower Cherokee Town of Chattooga (38Oc18), the Late Archaic midden site at Mims Point (38Ed9), and the Tyger Village (38Un215) in South Carolina, and the King Bee Site in Georgia.

REFERENCES

Dr. David Crass, State Archaeologist, Georgia Department of Natural Resources
Dr. Mark Williams, Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia
Dr. Stephen Kowalewski, Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia

Appendix V: Zooarchaeological Analysis, 1Ja643
by Susan L. Scott

Faunal Remains

Susan L. Scott

Several small samples of vertebrate faunal remains were recovered during excavation of 1JA 643 by Southern Research, Inc. Priorities for analysis included bone from Woodland Features 1, 3, and 4, and one column sample from each excavation block (A and B). In addition, all quarter inch bone from Block A was identified and quantified. Quarter inch materials from Block B were scanned for new taxa, as were fine screen samples from Block A. At least 25 mutually exclusive taxa were identified (Table 1). Fine screen samples added only two taxa, frog/toad and an unidentifiable rat. For analytical purposes, the samples from the site have been presented by time period represented. Both excavation blocks were divided into Archaic (Levels 9 and below for A, and 5 and below for B), Transitional (Levels 7-8 for A, 4 for B), and Woodland (Levels 5 and 6 for A, and 1-3 for B). In addition, for summary statistics, the bone refuse from all three feature are included as Woodland in age. The entire assemblage is comprised of over 700 bones. Data are presented in Tables 2 through 6, and include count, weight, and MNI, plus the number of charred fragments.

Among the research goals of this salvage excavation was to assess preservation conditions, and to examine the data generated for changes through time. Preservation at this site is excellent. Bone surfaces clearly exhibit both butchering marks, and gnawing marks left by rodents and dogs. Even very small taxa have survived in this midden, and there is virtually no evidence of leaching or mineralization. Given the apparent quality of the depositional environment and the quality of the resultant database, efforts should be made to recover more subsistence material from this and other sites currently eroding into Guntersville Lake.

Trends through time are less easily assessed because of small sample size, although in general, earlier deposits at this site appear to be more diversified, with small game compensating for reduced large mammal remains (Table 3). This minor difference could be due to a slight shift in seasonal utilization of the site. At contact, American Indians in the Southeast traditionally hunted deer during winter, and procured fish during the summer, although some of each resource could be exploited at other times of the year. If the Archaic levels of 1JA643 represent a mostly warm season occupation, the upper levels of 1JA643 could reflect lengthened seasonal occupation of the site during the Woodland period. Although sample sizes are small, this increasing large mammal trend is consistently present in all three analytical units of the site. An alternative cultural explanation for the observed pattern is that deer hunting intensified during the Woodland occupation of the site.

Only one firm seasonality marker was present in this small sample, a nearly complete deer toothrow in the Archaic deposit (Block A, TU8, L9). This

individual, estimated to be between 13 and 17 months of age, suggests warm season procurement. The breeding season for deer in the Southeast is variable, but fawns are usually born between May and August. Other deer in the sample were estimated, based on tooth wear, to be between 2 and 8 years of age. Three of ten examples are believed to be older than 6 years, with the remaining seven from deer adults in their prime.

This sample is too small to find meaningful patterns in deer elements at the site. All portions of deer are represented, although vertebrae and ribs are notably scarce. The absence of these axial elements could be due to natural attrition (dogs or acidic soils) or cultural factors (e.g.,boiling). Five butchering marks were observed on deer bone, three for removal of the feet (astragali and phalanges), or forelimb (radius), and for stripping muscle from bone (humerus shaft). Carnivore gnawing was observed on four elements from the feet, one cervical vertebra, a femur and a scapula.

Fish remains from the site strongly suggest procurement from a major river channel. The smallest estimated standard length (from the rostrum to the tail) is 30 cm, and the largest is 60 to 80 cm. Six of twelve sized individuals are estimated to be greater than 50 cm in length. The larger taxa include drum and blue or channel catfish. Three of five freshwater drum are estimated to have been greater than 50 cm in length. Drum this size are relatively rare in prehistoric assemblages. Three suckers were identified, but were not identifiable to genus or species with the comparative material available. They are not buffalo *(Ictiobus* sp), a sucker species associated with sluggish water environments.

In sum, although small, this assemblage of bone suggests a possible shift in seasonality of occupation through time, with a lengthened occupation in later time periods. This pattern may indicate increasing sedentism. Although many animals were consumed, deer were clearly the most important meat resource during all time periods represented. Deer remains indicate that warm season deer hunting occurred during the Archaic occupation of the site. Exceptionally large drum and large catfish suggest that the aquatic environment most frequently targeted for procurement was a major river channel. This small, but very well-preserved faunal assemblage indicates that further analysis would be very productive, and further excavation could improve our understanding of prehistoric economies in North Alabama.

Table 1. Species List for 1JA643

Opossum, *Didelphis virginiana*
Cottontail rabbit, *Sylvilagus florida*na
Gray squirrel, *Sciurus carolinensi*s
Beaver, *Castor canadensis*
Raccoon, *Procyon lotor*
Mink, *Mustela vison*
Dog, Wolf, Fox, Canidae
Whitetail deer, *Odocoileus virginianus*
Buzzard Hawk, Buteonidae
Wild turkey, *Meleagris gallopavo*
Softshell turtle, *Apalone* spp.
Mud/musk turtle, Kinosternidae
Box turtle, *Terrapene carolin*a
Cooter/Slider/Map turtle, *Pseudemys/Chrysemys/Graptem*ys
Viper, Viperidae
King/Rat/Corn snake, *Lampropeltis/Elaph*e spp.
Frog/Toad, *Bufo/Rana* spp.
Hellbender, *Cryptobranchus alleganiensis*
Bowfin, *Amia calva*
Gar, Lepisosteidae
Sucker, Catastomidae
Channel/Blue catfish, *Ictalurus punctatus/furcatus*
Bass, *Micropterus* sp.
Freshwater drum, *Aplodinotis grunniens*

Table 2. Faunal Inventory: Features

	FEA 1				FEA 3				FEA 4			
Common Name	NISP	NISP-Brn	Weight	MNI	NISP	NISP-brn	Weight	MNI	NISP	NISP-brn	Weight	MNI
Unid Large Mammal	12	2	11.5		1		7.1		5		4.3	
Dog/Wolf/Fox						1	0.2	1				
Whitetail Deer	2	1	21.5	1	1		2.6	1	3		49	1
Unid Turtle	3	2	1.4	1								
NISP	17	5	34.4	2	2	1	9.9	2	8		53.3	1

Table 3. Faunal Inventory: Block A

BLOCK A:	LVL 5-6 (Woodland)				LVL 7-8 (Transitional)				LVL 9-13 (Archaic)			
Common Name	NISP	NISP-Brn	Weight	MNI	NISP	NISP-brn	Weight	MNI	NISP	NISP-brn	Weight	MNI
Unid Large Mammal	94	19	81.2		132	45	106.8		62	8	35.7	
Unid Medium Mammal					7		6.3		8	4	3.2	
Unid Small Mammal					1		0.2		1		0.1	
Eastern Cottontail									2		0.6	1
Beaver	2		5.4	1								
Raccoon					2	1	1.6	1	2	1	2.8	1
Mink					1		0.3	1				
Whitetail Deer	20	2	95.7	2	23		73.6	1	17		76.1	
Lge Bird	11	1	3.4	1	19	6	5.1		16	2	4.9	
Med Bird									1		0.3	
Buzzard Hawk					1		0.2	1				
Turkey					2		1.7	1	1		0.6	1
Unid Turtle	21	2	8.7		20	3	5.8		18		6	
Soft Shell Turtle					1		0.2	1	2		1.2	1
Mud/Musk Turtle					1		0.2	1				
Box Turtle	1	1	0.3	1	1		1.5	1	1		2.8	1
Viper					2		0.3	1				
King Snake									1	1	0.1	1
Hellbender					1		0.3	1				
Unid. Fish	2		0.6		4		0.8		5		1.4	
Sucker	1		0.2	1					2		0.8	2
Catfish family									1		0.1	
Blue/Channel Catfish									1		0.8	1
Bass									1		0.9	1
Freshwater Drum	3		3.1	2	2		12.5	1	2		0.4	2
TOTAL NISP	155	25	198.6	8	220	55	217.4	11	144	16	138.8	13
UNID BONE	28	6	6.2		25	1	4.5		13	1	2.6	

Table 4. Faunal Inventory: Block A Column Sample

Block A Column Sample	LVL 5-6 (Woodland)				LVL 7-8 (Transitional)				LVL 9-13 (Archaic)			
Common Name	NISP	NISP-Brn	Weight	MNI	NISP	NISP-brn	Weight	MNI	NISP	NISP-brn	Weight	MNI
Unid Large Mammal	11	2	8.5		23	7	19.9		20		21.9	
Unid Medium Mammal	1	1	0.6	1	6		2		1		0.2	
Unid Small Mammal												
Opposum	1		0.8	1								
Eastern Gray Squirrel									1		0.2	1
Raccoon					1		1.2	1				
Whitetail Deer	7		17.4	1	4		20.7	1	2		2.7	1
Lge Bird					1	1	0.3					
Med Bird	1		0.3	1					3	1	0.6	1
Unid Turtle	2		0.6	1	4		0.9	1	2		1.3	1
Hellbender					1		0.3	1				
Unid Fish									1		0.2	
Catfish family	1		0.8	1	1		0.4		2		1.2	1
Blue/Channel Catfish					1		2	1				
TOTAL NISP	24	3	29	6	42	8	47.7	5	32	1	28.3	
UNID BONE	5		0.9		3		0.5		3		0.5	5

Table 5 Faunal Inventory: Block B Column Sample

Block B Column Sample	LVL 1-3 (Woodland)				LVL 4 (Transitional)				LVL 5-7 (Archaic)			
Common Name	NISP	NISP-Brn	Weight	MNI	NISP	NISP-brn	Weight	MNI	NISP	NISP-brn	Weight	MNI
Unid Large Mammal	68	8	33.3		4	2	1.6		47	2	27	
Unid Medium Mammal	1		0.1						1		0.1	1
Unid Small Mammal									1	1	0.4	1
Whitetail Deer	7		28.5						8	2	6.4	1
Lge Bird	3		0.7		1		0.2		6	1	1.4	1
Unid Turtle	1		0.1						2	1	0.4	1
Aquatic Emydid	1	1	0.2									
TOTAL NISP	81	9	62.9		5	2	1.8		65	7	35.7	5
UNID BONE	14	1	1.7						6	1	1	

Table 6. Relative Contributions of Major Taxonomic Categories to NISP and Weight

	Archaic		Transitional		Woodland	
	%NISP	%Weight	%NISP	%Weight	%NISP	%Weight
Large Mammal	64.7	83.7	70.5	83	80.2	91.6
Small Mammal	7.1	3.8	5	3.9	2.1	2.1
Bird	11.2	3.8	10	3.2	5.2	1.4
Turtle	10.4	5.8	10.5	3.5	10.1	3.5
Snake	0.4	0	0.9	0.1	0	0
Amphibian	0	0	0.5	0.1	0	0
Fish	6.2	2.9	2.7	6.1	2.4	1.5